

Dear Chairman
Martin:

I am writing to question the Comcast/Time Warner/Adelphia merger (FCC Docket No. 05-192) and the AT&T/BellSouth merger (FCC Docket No. 06-74). I am not convinced that allowing the largest telecommunications company and the two largest cable companies and in the United States to grow even larger serves the public interest.

The concentration of media power is a growing problem in this country. Though we have more channels available than ever before, they are increasingly falling under the control of a handful of giant corporations. The cost of broadband service also remains out of reach for many households.

Americans are hungry
for more competition
in services.
However, these
mergers will only
starve Americans of
this needed
competition.

Allowing AT&T to
combine with
BellSouth will give
the top three
broadband providers
control of over half
of all broadband
connections in the
country. At the same
time, the Time
Warner/Comcast/Adelphia
merger will give
Comcast and Time
Warner increased
power over entire
regions of the
United States,
allowing rates to
rise even as the
digital divide
continues to grow.

The FCC should block
these transactions
or impose strict
conditions to
protect free speech,
fair pricing, and
competition under
its "public interest

standard." If the FCC decides to allow either of these mergers, it should require the following conditions:

1. Subscribers must be able to choose from competitive broadband Internet Service Providers ("open access"). The FCC should also ensure that these companies cannot discriminate against any Internet content or rival service and that every service will be treated exactly the same ("Network Neutrality").

2. Companies must be required, in addition to bundled services, to sell broadband access separate from video and telephone service, and at the same price ("naked broadband" or "unbundling"), and to make this option clear to potential

consumers.

3. Any subscriber must be able to connect any device to the network (such as a Wi-Fi router) that does not harm the network.

4. Take steps to protect public access programming ("PEG"). Cable companies have become less responsive to the needs and requirements of communities. The quality of public accountability in local franchise agreements has declined, as big companies leverage their power to squeeze local governments by threatening regulatory arbitrage tactics. Likewise, telecommunications giants — like AT&T — are trying to eliminate the remaining vestiges of effective local oversight and

control altogether.

5. Independent programmers must be able to reach subscribers. We are required to buy channels we don't want or need because providers of video service bundle them together.

6. Any company that owns both programming and video systems should be required to provide competitors with access to their regional sports and other programming needed to offer competing services, so consumers will still have real choices.

In conclusion, I ask the FCC to consider the interests of the people like me who pay the cable, telephone and broadband bills and watch the programming. Many of us already have enough trouble

trying to afford
broadband or cable
TV. Please don't
make it even harder
for us to find
competitors, or make
it easier for
Comcast, Time Warner
and AT&T to raise
prices or block
local and
independent voices.

AT&T was split for
a reason, and we
know from experience
that the competitive
environment that the
split-up created was
a major contributor
to the explosion of
innovation, choice,
and lowered
information services
pricing that occurred
in the late 1980's
through the 1990's.

Please understand
that the public
interest can only be
served by a strongly
competitive market.